

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action of September 7, 2006 is respectfully requested.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected several of the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner rejected dependent claim 25 because it is not clear “which of the electrically insulating substrates is the component embedded within” (emphasis added). However, the Examiner is requested to note that claim 25 depended from claim 19, which does not recite *multiple* electrically insulating substrates. Therefore, it is submitted that it is entirely clear which electrically insulating substrate is being referred to in claim 25. Although claim 25 has now been amended so as to depend from allowable dependent claim 17, it is submitted that these remarks still apply to amended claim 25, and that amended claim 25 still fully complies with all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

With respect to the Examiner’s formal rejection of claim 26, the Examiner merely asserted that claim 26 is “structurally indefinite.” Unfortunately, the reasons for the Examiner’s assertion that dependent claim 26 is structurally indefinite are not clear, and may be related to the Examiner’s improper understanding of base claim 25 as discussed above. Nonetheless, dependent claim 26 has now been slightly amended in an effort to address the Examiner’s formal rejection, and it is submitted that amended claim 26 fully complies with all the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

With respect to the formal rejection of claim 27, the Examiner is requested to note that claim 27 has now been slightly amended in an effort to address the Examiner’s concerns.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner’s formal rejections under § 112 have been overcome. However, if the Examiner still believes that any formal modifications to the claims are necessary, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicant’s undersigned representative by phone to further discuss these matters.

On pages 2-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claim 19 and dependent claims 20-28 as being unpatentable over the Andou reference, the Chen ‘335 reference, or the Hayashi reference, in view of the Chen ‘363 reference. However, on page 6 of

the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 15-18 are allowed. Consequently, the claims have now been amended as explained below.

In particular, claim 19 has now been amended so as to depend from allowable independent claim 17. In addition, dependent claims 20-28 have also been amended so as to depend directly from claim 17. Therefore, in view of the Examiner's indication that claim 17 is allowable, it is submitted that amended dependent claims 19-28 are also now in condition for allowance in view of their dependence from allowed claim 17.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Hideki HIGASHITANI

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
December 7, 2006